

APPROVED AT THE 05-19-22 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING



**APPROVED AS AMENDED
SUMMARIZED MINUTES**

**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

**Thursday, April 21, 2022
Kiva-City Hall
3939 N. Drinkwater Boulevard
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251**

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Anderson called the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission to order at 5:16 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Don Anderson, Vice Chair
Karen Kowal
B. Kent Lall
Mary Ann Miller
Kerry Wilcoxon

ABSENT: Pamela Iacovo, Chair

STAFF: Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Manager
Kiran Guntupalli, Principal Traffic Engineer
Phil Kercher, Traffic Engineer & Ops Manager
Mark Melnychenko, Transportation & Streets Director
Greg Davies, Senior Transportation Planner

PUBLIC COMMENT

Laura Norton Schwartz introduced herself as living in a cul-de-sac off of 68th Street south of Camelback. Residents have felt trapped within the area as there is no safe way to walk on 68th Street. There is no sidewalks and pedestrians must walk in bike lanes adjacent to vehicles. A citizen petition was presented at the City Council meeting on March 29th, which requested construction of a sidewalk between Camelback and Indian School roads along 68th Street.

Harold Back introduced himself as a member of the 68th Street Sidewalk Association and resident of the area. He discussed his experience as a blind individual, who exited a bus expecting to find a sidewalk and walk home safely. However, no sidewalk was present and he was subjected to conditions of tremendous traffic with no buffer between himself and vehicles.

Two written comments from Laura Norton Schwartz were also received prior to the meeting.

Commissioner asked whether installation of sidewalk in this segment has been on the radar at any point. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that he wrote the project description for a submittal to Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) over two years ago. This was intended to be a start to projects for improvements for the whole 68th corridor for a better pedestrian environment. As part of the Prop 400 extension, it did not make their list of projects. The City has it as a recommended corridor for improvements in the Transportation Action Plan (TAP). Costs for construction of the sidewalks are currently being evaluated. Grant funding is an option, however, this is a lengthy process, usually taking several years.

Commissioner inquired about the possibility of a temporary solution, which would block or shift part of the bike lane for use as a pedestrian walkway. Mr. Meinhart stated that due to the traffic volume levels, it would be difficult to take away the center turn lane, which is where the extra space would come from.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no modifications.

COMMISSIONER MILLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ON MARCH 17, 2022 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER KOWAL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR ANDERSON, COMMISSIONERS KOWAL, LALL, MILLER AND WILCOXON VOTING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES.

2. RECENT AND PROJECT RELATED CIP COST INCREASES

Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Manager, noted that costs for grant funded CIP projects and Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) projects have grown exponentially over the past year. Four grant projects have seen an increase of \$8.1 million. Among the 21 ALCP projects has been an increase in costs of \$135.9 million. Key drivers of cost increases were reviewed.

Grant project cost changes were reviewed for the following projects:

- McDowell Road Bicycle Lanes from Pima Road to 64th Street
- Osborn Road Complete Street: Scottsdale Road to Hayden Road
- Indian Bend Wash Underpass at Chaparral Road
- 68th Street: Indian School Road to Thomas Road

Commissioner noted the staggering increases for some projects. Mr. Meinhart stated that some of the cost increases were attributed to bid timing. For example, the McDowell Road project bid in February of last year was only 6 percent different from the engineer's estimate. The Osborn

Road project, bid seven months later, was 75 percent higher. Due to federal money invested in projects, the City is under very strict timing guidelines.

Commissioner asked whether anyone has looked at the processes by which original applications and budgets were developed in an effort to avoid these budget estimating processes in the future. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that they have a much more robust internal estimating process. An additional measure, which would require a significant investment, would be to complete concept designs and cost estimations prior to grant submittal.

Greg Davies, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the ALCP:

- Proposition 400 Funding Program
- Sales Tax Deposited Into Regional Area Road Fund
- Includes Federal Funds
- Maricopa Association of Governments Oversight
- Focuses on Roadway Capacity Improvements
- Region Pays 70 Percent
- Agencies Pay 30 Percent
- Entire Project Cost Programmed in Agency's Capital Program
- Reimbursement Program

ALCP Projects were reviewed according to funding categories:

- ALCP Cost Increases: No future development funding partners
- ALCP Cost Increases: Potential future development funding partners
- Potential ALCP Cost Decreases

In summary, the total project cost increase through Fiscal Year 25/26 is \$135.9 million. Net increased revenue from outside sources is \$21.9 million and total funding required is \$114 million. Next steps were reviewed.

Commissioner asked about flexibility to defer ALCP projects to future years. Mr. Davies confirmed that programs can be deferred in the ALCP program. In addition, funds can be moved within a corridor. Mr. Meinhart added that there is an end date to Prop 400, December 31st, 2025, for the collection of revenues. MAG has not provided guidance on official cut-off dates.

Commissioner inquired about the ability to shift cost savings to other projects. Mr. Meinhart stated that MAG has strict rules for managing project savings. This includes a prohibition against shifting funds to another project corridor until the savings are proven and the work is completed.

Vice Chair Anderson commented that with the significant rise in costs, it seems likely that some projects will have to be cut. Mr. Davies commented that it is hoped that some of the offset will come through collaboration with developers. The listed projects have been deemed important and well-needed, however, it is a possibility that some may be cut or delayed. Mr. Meinhart added that there is a process to fully eliminate a project from the ALCP program, including agreement by the Region that the project is infeasible. It is more likely that adjustments in scope would be made.

3. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN REQUIREMENT FOR OLD TOWN DEVELOPMENT

Walt Brodzinski, Right of Way Manager, stated that right of way management program began in the Transportation Department in 2008. The program coordinates activities that occur in the public right of way. These elements may include pedestrian activity, bikes, cars, special events, CIP projects, private development and the City's maintenance activities. In addressing the question of why a private development construction impact plan (PDCIP) is needed, it is notable that the impacts to the public right of way during construction of a private development are sometimes misunderstood, significant and long-term. Most high density projects, especially in the downtown areas, are built to the property line, leaving little or no room for equipment, materials or worker parking. A plan would identify these impacts and set expectations on how these impacts are scheduled and mitigated by the developer. Key elements of the PDCIP may become binding. Example project details were discussed.

Details of the PDCIP were reviewed:

- Constructability is considered during design
- Project impacts can be understood during development review
- City can gauge what the impacts will be during plan review
- Helps the community understand what the impacts will be
- Sets expectations for contractors
- Assists public safety planning and response
- Overall sets expectations for the project

Key elements may include:

- Project information signing
- Site demolition
- Site fencing
- Haul routes (import/export of material)
- Work hours
- Material delivery and storage
- Equipment storage and operation
- Construction worker parking

Public impacts identified and addressed in the PDCIP include: Streets; sidewalks; bike paths/routes; parking; city services and public safety. The PDCIP should not be confused with a construction management plan.

Commissioner asked about current methods for the City to address issues such as parking availability or noise during construction projects. Mr. Brodzinski stated that such issues are typically handled as they arise. Parking mitigation could involve a meeting with the building inspectors and the contractor.

Commissioner recommended that a checklist be added to the plans. The list would contain all the elements that must be addressed in the construction management plan. Mr. Brodzinski said that ultimately, this would likely be incorporated into the design standards and policies manual.

Commissioner asked for confirmation that street and sidewalk closures during construction must be approved by the City. Mr. Brodzinski said this is true to some degree. There is a process for a marshaling yard, which is an area that a contractor can rent from the City to lay down materials and hold a job trailer. Enforcement has not been as stringent as it could be. The permit is not administered by traffic engineering or the Transportation Department.

Vice Chair asked if the City requires a formal traffic control plan as part of the construction planning and permitting process. Mr. Brodzinski confirmed this requirement in instances where the contractor will be causing impacts to utility work, removing sidewalks or impacting other traffic conditions.

Commissioner recommended the development of a standard manual to be provided to contractors.

COMMISSIONER MILLER MOVED TO DIRECT STAFF TO WORK WITH OTHER CITY DEPARTMENTS TO DEVELOP A PLAN FOR REVIEW. COMMISSIONER KOWAL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR ANDERSON, COMMISSIONERS KOWAL, LALL, MILLER AND WILCOXON VOTING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES.

4. OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PROGRAM STATUS

Mr. Melnychenko provided an overview of projects and programs:

- Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (HAWK) at Thomas Road and 86th Street
- Alley Pavement Program
- Cactus Trail vegetation removal and maintenance
- Hayden Road jogging trail erosion repairs
- Thunderbird Road Trail Hayden Road to 76th Street
- April Bike Month: Cycle the Arts 2022
- RAISE Grant application: Project location at 2nd Street from 75th Street to Goldwater Boulevard
- Blue Zones partnership
- Citizen petition: Sidewalk gaps on 68th Street
- Citizen petition: Improved crossing to canal path at Jackrabbit Road

5. COMMISSION IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The following agenda items were identified:

- Update on traffic safety
- Invite new Valley Metro CEO to speak about regional transportation
- Introduction of Scottsdale's new Sustainability Director

6. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved by Commissioner Wilcoxon and seconded by Commissioner Kowal, the meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

AYES: Vice Chair Anderson, Commissioners Kowal, Lall, Miller and Wilcoxon

NAYS: None

SUBMITTED BY:

eScribers, LLC

***Note: These are summary action meeting minutes only. A complete copy of the audio/video recording is available at <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/boards/transp.asp>**